

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawing includes changes to FIG. 17. This sheet replaces the original sheet including FIG. 17. In this new sheet, FIG. 17 has been amended to replace “DTL” with “JTL” as required by the Examiner.

REMARKS

1. In response to the Office Action mailed August 29, 2006, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration. Claim 1 was originally presented in the application. In the outstanding Office Action, all claims have been rejected. By the foregoing Amendments, all previously pending claims (*i.e.*, claim 1) have been canceled. Claims 2-22 have been added. Thus, upon entry of this paper, claims 2-22 will be pending in this application. Of these twenty-one (21) claims, claims (claims 2, 9, and 16) are independent. Based on the above Amendments and following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that all outstanding objections and rejections be reconsidered, and that they be withdrawn.

Amendments to the Specification

2. The amendments to the specification are to address the Examiner's objection to the specification because of various informalities. Based on the above Amendments, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the Specification be withdrawn.

Objections to the Drawings

3. The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.121(d) because element 64 of Figure 17 is incorrectly labeled. The replacement drawings sheets attached hereto include a replacement drawing sheet which amends FIG. 17 as recommended by the Examiner. Withdrawal of this objection is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Art of Record

4. Applicants acknowledge receipt of form PTO-892 identifying additional references made of record by the Examiner.

5. Applicants thank the Examiner for returning the form PTO-1449 filed by Applicant on August 12, 2003, which have been initialed by the Examiner indicating consideration of the references cited therein.

6. Applicants have filed an additional Information Disclosure Statement making of reference the references cited in the Specification.

Claim Objections

7. Claim1 has been objected to because the third limitation is grammatically incorrect. Applicants have canceled claim 1 and respectfully submit that these objections are accordingly rendered moot.

Claim Rejections


8. Independent claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps. Additionally, independent claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipate over U.S. Patent No. 6,314,558 to Angel, *et al.* (hereinafter, "Angel").

9. Applicants have canceled claim 1, thus rendering the Examiner's rejections moot. Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 2-22 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and §102(b). Applicants accordingly respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of previously pending claim 1.

Conclusion

10. In view of the foregoing, this application should be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael G. Verga
Reg. No. 39,410
Tel. (703) 563-2005

December 19, 2006

Appendix A

Replacement Drawings

Application No. 10/640,626

Title: Instrumenting Java Code By Modifying Bytecodes

Atty. Docket No. 10017135-1